

WESK

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

APR 3 1953

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

INDUSTRY'S STAKE IN HUMAN RELATIONS

(An Exploratory Conference)

Compiled and Edited by

KENNETH RECKNAGEL

Foreword	<i>William B. Maloney</i>	221
Teamwork in Industry		223
Recognition of the Need		227
Steps Already Taken in Assuming This Responsibility		231
Steps Ahead		250
Conference Program		260
Bibliography		266

FEBRUARY 1953

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

157 WEST 13TH ST., NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

Editorial Staff

E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor-in-Chief* JOHN C. PAYNE, *Asst. Managing Editor*
ABRAHAM I. KATSH, *Asst. Managing Editor*
GLADYS MARKIM, *Asst. Managing Editor*
DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Editor* EVELYN F. DODSON, *Business Manager*
HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, STEPHEN G. RICH,
I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, ESTHER HILTON, ETHEL ALPENFELD,
Associate Editors.

Permanent Department

Book Reviews

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

Board of Trustees

E. GEORGE PAYNE, <i>President</i>	MAURICE MOFFATT
HERBERT D. HARPER, <i>Vice-President</i>	STEPHEN G. RICH
HENRY W. MEISSNER, <i>Secretary</i>	WILLIAM ROSENGARTEN, SR.
I. DAVID SATLOW, <i>Treasurer</i>	W. CLINTON STUART
DAN W. DODSON, <i>Managing Trustee</i>	

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, 157 West 13th St., New York 11, N.Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25, all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N.Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry at the Post Office at Manchester, N. H., authorized January 16, 1950.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 26

February 1953

No. 56

FOREWORD

"The opinions and ideas shared in a Teamwork in Industry Institute at Rutgers University last summer, the new points of view developed, and the inspiration gained from the discussions, addresses, and informal get-togethers convinced me and, I believe, all those in attendance that conferences of this type need repeating.

"I am grateful that the 'Journal of Educational Sociology' has made it possible for these discussions and addresses to be summarized and interpreted by Mr. Recknagel, so that this human relations effort can be shared with others in industry and the social sciences."

William B. Maloney
Manager, Employee Relations Department
Esso Standard Oil Company

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING WITHIN INDUSTRY

(An Editorial)

An important aspect of human relations programs in the United States is what is happening within its industrial structure. Unless mutual respect and appreciation among all Americans is more than just "do goodism" the significance of the movement is likely to be limited. The economic base of livelihood being what it is, the recognition of the rights of all people to participate in the economic opportunities becomes one of the challenging points of the democratic system.

An attempt to find a statement of this impact in industry, revealed much pioneering work in many directions but perhaps the outstanding efforts were those of the "Teamwork Within Industry" Commission on Labor Management Organization of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This Commission attempts to bring persons from colleges and universities to plants to present basic facts about intergroup relations to representatives of labor and management in training programs within the plant. These efforts have culminated in annual conferences. Each conference has grown in its significance to the American industrial scene. It is the conference held last summer that is presented in this February number of the *Journal of Educational Sociology*. In choosing a way to present the conference's richness it was felt that a mere presentation of speeches would leave the flavor of the conference somewhat flat. It has been known for a long time that the atmosphere or climate in which peoples work is important. As a consequence, we asked Mr. Kenneth Recknagel to pull together the outcomes of the conference in such fashion as to preserve some of its "interacting" quality. The speeches are integrated into the running discussion of a panel which did "role playing", and the findings of the conference are integrated into the total scheme and presented as "the steps ahead".

It is hoped this number will open doors in industrial plants across the United States and that it will provide those working in the field with some understanding of how these programs have operated, with a view that it might stimulate such programs in other industries.

The editors wish to express their appreciation to Mr. Clarence Peters, the Commission Director, and Mr. Kenneth Recknagel, its Program Director, for helping us to present to our readers this Monograph. We believe that our readers will appreciate their efforts.

Dan W. Dodson

TEAMWORK IN INDUSTRY

Kenneth H. Recknagel

In the past fifteen years we have seen an upsurge in popular interest and serious concern in the need for America to move faster and nearer to that century-old Utopian dream: the establishment of a democratic society.

The awareness of this need developed heightening saliency with the conclusion of World War II, when America's thinkers and liberal citizenry lifted their heads, refreshed with new hope and dedicated with resolution that the tomorrow's world would be good. What had become a slogan four decades ago had become an undeniable fact: this must be the war to end all wars. And Americans must be leaders among men.

These social engineers who plot the qualities and quantities of men's thoughts and actions, knowing full well that as one cannot enter the "Kingdom of Heaven" on an invocation — nor establish a "Kingdom of God on Earth" with wishes — a society cannot realize World Peace without dedication, energy, directed cooperative effort and constant vigilance.

Ideas that were conceived on the world battlefields and in the university halls, nurtured in the daydreams of young students, optimistic political thinkers and socially conscious scientists of man, crystalized, took shape and have been maturing into fresh new disciplines and renewed causes. Group dynamics, a theoretical and practical synthesis of phases of psychology, sociology, and common sense; World Brotherhood, a re-emphasis of century-old idealism transformed into 20th century Humanism with social science texts; Marshall Plan and Point Four, political wisdom and social idealism in materialistic terms; and our concern here, the new area of social science: "human and intergroup relations".

Through the process of conjecture, research and experimentation, discussion, propaganda and direct experience, the term "good human relations" has become as familiar in the professional parlance and as paramount in the professional conscience of educators as the term "curriculum development".

American educators of society, cognizant of the innate resistance of men to outside authority, realized that our schemes to legislate democracy and peace and group cooperation and respect, organized and planned ways whereby our citizens old and young could partake of learning experiences which would make each of them aware of the necessity for self-discipline in social relations.

Do-gooders and social actionists together have become socializers promoting civilized behavior patterns for constructive equalitarian relations — man to man and group with group.

Democracy had to be proven; this too was both a fact and a challenge. If the New Age was to be a glorious Era of Peace, then it also follows that it must be both a national and World Age of Human Equality. The securing of those invaluable human rights for which our nation has fought wars, composed anthems and written historic proclamations and defeated national candidates, must be given meaning through reality. This human rights factor was and still is one of the paramount hurdles which our country's leaders must surmount if either Democracy, or Peace could be secured.

Our national and international leaders could no longer tolerate a condition where "The peoples of the world cannot hear what we say because what we do keeps dinning in their ears."

As a consequence, social scientists and social actionists, joining the ranks in this crusade for a democratic and peaceful society, have with increasing vigor, directed their efforts towards these two objectives "Democracy must begin in the home in the family circle"—say the marriage and family relations specialists, we cannot have peace and harmony in wide spheres of human living if our parents and children do not develop skills for getting along democratically and constructively in their interpersonal relations.

Churches, recognizing that no one faith, sect or denomination can ever hold the monopoly on men's souls and spiritual life, realized too that cooperation and a spirit of toleration and respect must be developed if any religious group could survive.

Social scientists, many of them turning from the laboratory and the classroom, have become professional social workers directing their energies to propagandizing and organizing a public opinion which would become aware of the value of ethnic differences in a nation such as ours.

The vast stream of knowledge concerning race relations, anti-semitism, and other forms of prejudice and discrimination were being integrated and systemized into an applied and theoretical discipline called intergroup relations, and a broader area "human relations".

Until recently, labor unions have in part been concerned with only one aspect of human relations, fighting for the employment rights of minority groups. They have generally been on the side of those waging an aggressive campaign for the passing of laws which will force equal opportunity. They have attempted to legalize Democracy. For example, the executive secretary of a regional CIO Council recently credited the American Trade union movement as the single most

potent factor in the advancement of civil rights legislation. He cited the following reasons for union's leadership in this cause:

- A. The American trade union movement has strong, equalitarian ideological inducement.
- B. The industrial working population contains large segments of foreign-born and other minority groups. They have experienced discrimination and have vowed to eradicate it.
- C. "American trade unionism is one of the forces that has stood up and been counted on this subject of civil rights. I daresay that the American trade unionism movement, with pardonable pride for it is the most potent factor in support of civil rights legislation for the present time and has been that for the past ten years," and as a result of this aggressive pressuring for equal rights, this union official cited these concrete effects:
 1. because of unionization, there have been more employment opportunities for minorities;
 2. there have been industries which practiced discrimination which have been forced to abandon their policies by union pressure exerted through contract negotiations;
 3. unions, both AFL and CIO, incorporated anti-discrimination clauses in contracts, in resolutions at National Conventions;
 4. leaflets, exhibits and speeches are all utilized to educate members against religious, nationality or racial prejudice;
 5. union officials and members, both formally and informally, are active in community, state and nation civil rights commissions, and in efforts to legislate FEPC, abolish segregation in Armed Forces and public Housing.

Industrial management, on the other hand, has often taken an anti-thetical stand that if anything — we need to *educate* "equality", to *teach* democracy.

Both stands, as we will see, are necessary. Industry, both management and labor however, must realize that as the other institutions in our society, they must look at their social obligations in broader perspective. Industry must work along with the school and universities, the churches and temples, and the community organizations to carry their share of the training load for a) health, b) character, c) citizenship and now sound human relations.

A very significant indication of the increasing realization on the part of some leaders from management and organized labor of the need for their assuming broader responsibility for sound democratic relations and intergroup cooperation in industrial and community life is evidenced when one reviews the reports emerging from the annual "Teamwork in Industry" Institutes sponsored by the Labor-Management Organizations Commission of the National Conference of Christians and Jews over the past two years. These conferences held on university campuses and co-sponsored by their industrial and labor relations schools have served as a vehicle for the exchange of opinion and analysis of mutual problems and responsibilities in the area of inter-group relations by approximately five hundred top-level representatives from organized labor and industrial management throughout the nation. In addition to making an inventory of progressive achievements and remaining unresolved problems in the realm of human relations and intergroup relations, these annual convocations have also been designed to serve as a medium for national evaluation of the programming activities and consultative services offered by the National Conference in the field of commerce and industry. In order that we may become more familiar with the current steps being taken by industry to assume their responsibility in the human relations and intergroup relations fields, as well as to get a sample of labor and industry's opinions regarding their own leadership role in this area, we will summarize and analyze the proceedings of one of the most recent "Teamwork in Industry" Institutes held on the campus of Rutgers University. This Conference was conducted by the Commission on Labor-Management Organizations and the Institute of Management and Labor Relations; sponsored by: The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, the New Jersey State Federation of Labor, AFL, the New Jersey State CIO Council, and the Division Against Discrimination, State of New Jersey, Department of Education; and made possible through generous contributions from Esso Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, American Smelting and Refining Company, and the RCA Victor Division of the Radio Corporation of America.

Reviewing the complete stenotype reports of the addresses, the group discussions and the resolutions passed by sub-groups at the Conference, we can logically divide the voluminous collection of opinions, facts, descriptions and recommendations into three general topical categories as follows:.

- I. Recognition of the need for the industrial citizen to assume a human relations and group relations responsibility in his company, union and community.

- II. Steps and approaches already taken, problems encountered in assuming this responsibility; and
- III. Possible programs to implement the development of constructive human relations and intergroup relations in plant and community life.

I. RECOGNITION OF THE NEED.

Sifting through the addresses and discussion at the Rutgers Institute, the following conclusions were reached regarding the need for industry and labor to assume an active responsibility in the development of sound programs to build constructive human relations and cooperative relations between various ethnic groups in an industrial working force and in the industrial community:

- A. *The index of human relations can be used as a thermometer revealing the social health of an industrial plant and community.* This concept implies that if any plant management or community desired to measure its progress and development and present condition, it must not ignore the "human factor", but must include it along with production rates, assets, physical expansion, and wage rates, as one of the essential factors determining the future success.

We might cite, in this regard, a story told by Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, regarding a conversation along these lines, which he had with Henry Ford II.

"Sitting in his office one day soon after World War II, this alert young man, who heads the vast Ford Motors development, said that there are four elements in the production of economic goods: one is access to raw materials; the second is choosing manpower; the third is mechanical technology and the fourth is moral or spiritual. 'We can hire experts to solve the first three' he said, 'but the moral or spiritual factor is the toughest of all.' 'Quite amazed, I asked, 'What are the moral and spiritual problems in making automobiles?'

"Mr. Ford replied, 'The problem of human relationships. If we could get workers on the assembly line, in the front offices, in all the departments, who are skilled in the art of teamwork, among Protestants, Catholics and Jews, of all races and all nationalities, we could pay better wages, make better profits and sell cars to the public at lower prices. The variable is the moral element of good human relations.'"

Industry, particularly accustomed to production and profit data measured against a norm or goal, might therefore effect-

ively use the community self-survey as a model for exposing their own personnel relations situation at any given period.

It is true that through the use of anonymous personal interviews of a representative sample in a plant population, or questionnaires administered, with an outside agency, we have one way of determining personnel's attitudes regarding each other, and various ethnic or occupational groups in the plant free of the stamp of union or management bias. Numerous companies have utilized these methods as a means of embarking on a sound human relations program.

On the other hand, it would appear that one of the most effective means of both determining the degrees of + or - interpersonal and intergroup attitudes and sentiments, the nature of prejudices held by any one group in the work force against another group, would be to utilize a modification of the self-survey. If the index of human relations can be used as a thermometer, indicating the social health of a plant, then certainly one of the most effective ways of finding out whether a company's intergroup and interpersonal relations are normal or subnormal, as measured against an ideal situation - would be to involve a group of responsible union and management representatives and together work out a scheme for organizing group discussion, or group interviews, collecting pertinent data, and analyzing this data to determine what needs exist in the intergroup or human relations area, and what means could be utilized, employing both plant and outside resources to meet these needs. As is inherent in a self-survey, a community or plant group learns by doing. By finding out the facts for themselves a group of plant and office workers and supervisors see the need, without exhortation, and become involved in plans for change, with artificial motivational attractions unnecessary.

Any plant survey team in the process of analyzing the data would necessarily become involved in the "doing something about it" planning phases of any educational or organizations program designed to move toward the "ideal".

- B. *Any community has the major responsibility of opening the door of opportunity for all of its citizens, regardless of race, creed or national origin, to participate in and share the benefits derived from the economic, political and social life in that community.*

Industrial sociologists have spent a great deal of research energy to verify the theory that an industrial organization

has a social system which parallels the social system of the community. Nor do they represent two societies existing in isolation. A plant is affected to a large extent by what the community itself is doing, in the schools, in housing, in recreational areas, and in religious life. The mores and social pressures, both informal and formal, are manifested in the plant in a variety of ways, ranging from: who shall be foreman, to whether or not, the plant shall have a cafeteria.

One participant in a discussion group at the Institute dramatized this point with an example: A plant located in a South Jersey community was unable to hire Negroes despite the state fair employment law because Negroes could not find housing in that community and would have had to commute daily back and forth from work to the New York metropolitan area, a practice which would make hiring them impractical.

Another industrial representative pointed out that a survey conducted in his state revealed that in those areas where there were segregated schools there were fewer Negroes working in skilled jobs and only a very few Negroes in supervisory jobs.

Simply pointing out the need for communities to accept their legal and moral responsibility to provide equal opportunities, does not, it would seem, preclude an industry or labor union from taking the initiative in calling a community's attention to the factors existing in that community's social pattern which hinder a democratic intergroup process from developing. A plant management or a labor union might with great effectiveness show concrete ways how the economic life in the area was being crippled by obsolete and unrealistic community mores, preventing industries from utilizing to the maximum the labor potential existing in the community.

The fact that this point was not brought up in this discussion, the assigning of responsibility, is evidence that community organization leaders, industrial sociologists and labor educators need to emphasize the necessity for both management and labor to assume *leadership* as well as to participate actively with other institutions in developing a democratic society.*

*For elaboration of this idea see, "Bread, Freedom and Business Men", by Sidney Hook, *Fortune Magazine*, September, 1951, pp. 117.

For example, as Senator Malcolm Forbes, of New Jersey, pointed out, research conducted by FORBES MAGAZINE for an article, which appeared in their January 1952 issue, on the subject of human relations progress in industry, uncovered the fact that *most industries limit their community consciousness to such "fringe benefits" as support of Red Cross Drives, or having a pretty planting done around the factory, with practically no attention given to the basic issues where a corporation is in a position to exert an enormously useful function in the community.*

It would follow, therefore, from this evidence that not only is there need for active community leadership arising from the industrial resources in a community, but these potential leaders in management and union need some guidance, some apprenticeship in participation in community affairs. Leadership is won not bought — and contributing to a Community Chest Drive is important, but it is also union and industry's responsibility to see that their money is spent for the advancement of a progressively more democratic community, not necessarily for the reinforcement of the *status quo*.

C. *There are two major factors essential to industrial teamwork:*

1. The *individual* in the plant force must be made to feel important, to feel that he is counted on and a member of the team.
2. For people to get along, cooperatively and amicably with one another, despite differences in cultural backgrounds, religious beliefs and in physical appearance, they must be helped to overcome their age-old prejudices about these racial, religious and nationality group differences. Teamwork on the job and in the community requires conscious effort and in many cases reformed attitudes and behavior patterns.

II. STEPS ALREADY TAKEN IN ASSUMING THIS RESPONSIBILITY.

For the past three years, the Labor-Management Organizations Commission of the National Conference of Christians and Jews has been organizing, as its major endeavor, a Teamwork in Industry program designed to help provide companies with the key factors, including the psychic satisfaction of workers, as well as a sound educational program to modify attitudes of prejudice essential for the building of good intergroup relations among industrial personnel. Individual ten-week adult education courses, designed to provide plant personnel with new facts, new understandings and new skills about other people with whom they work and live, are being conducted by NCCJ with the cooperation and sponsorship of company managements and local unions throughout the United States.

The "Teamwork in Industry" program has as its principal objectives: to provide industrial personnel, both labor and management, with vital facts about the problems of prejudice and discrimination and resulting interpersonal and intergroup human relations tensions and conflicts which prevent plant and community teamwork; and on the basis of these facts, to develop new intergroup relations attitudes and problem-solving skills which are essential for the building of a democratic, cooperative and productive labor-management team.

The following basic methods are employed in the program for reducing intergroup tension and conflict:

- a. The principle of participation;
- b. The principle of group action; (Theories of group dynamics point to the fact that amiable sentiments about the brotherhood of man and the rewards of cooperation are not enough. Much more spontaneous energy will come from a group where the structure has been designed to encourage this process. Both in pre-project planning and in week-by-week planning, attempts are made to constantly create a climate which encourages group investigation, group analysis, group decision and group action.)
- c. The principle of building clear communication lines between labor and management, and between plant personnel is a result of planning and discussion.
- d. The principle of facts first. Kill the rumor, find the facts and thrash out the problems through free, open discussion.

- e. The principle of learning through groups. A man draws his strength from people, not from groups.*

For the past three years, trained sociologists and inter-group relations specialists have been evaluating this program. On the basis of this evaluation, NCCJ has been refining it so that it will more adequately fulfill the function of providing plant personnel with these so-called psychic satisfactions, as well as with a new and profitable human relations learning experience. Such a program can be reflected directly and indirectly in the plant and community in terms of:

- a. material gains, such as less absenteeism, less waste, and increased production,
- b. moral and spiritual benefits such as a rising of general plant and department morale, less friction between employees, or employees and supervisors, and more secure and stable relations between union and management leaders.

These gains can also be reflected in a measure in the community as well. The Labor-Management Organizations Commission could cite innumerable examples of individuals taking the initiative in calling attention to local human relations problems in their local organizations, in their schools and churches, and in their community at large.

A great deal of attention has been given to this program at the annual Teamwork in Industry Institutes, in an attempt to acquaint leaders in industry, both management and labor, with this in-plant program. The techniques of organizing the program have been discussed, the method of group discussion supplemented by competent resource consultants is appraised, and the over-all techniques and objectives have been evaluated.

During the Rutgers University Institute, a role-playing session was organized to demonstrate a "typical" Teamwork in Industry project discussion. Moderators from recent projects, including Dr. William E. Vickery, N. Y. State Teachers College, Albany, N.Y.; Dr. Harold A. Lett, Division Against Discrimination, State Department of Education, Newark, N. J.; Dr. Max Wolff, Teachers College, Columbia University; and Dr. J. Martin Klotsche, President, Wisconsin State College, Milwaukee. They assumed the roles of resource consultants, workers and management participating in a typical project discussion. Clarence A. Peters, Director of the Labor-Management Organizations Commission, acted as leader of the sessions. For purposes of illustration, an excerpt from the transcript is included here:

*For further elaboration of these principles, see "*Roads to Agreement*", Stuart Chase, Harper & Bros., New York, 1951.

INTRODUCTION:

Around this table are representatives from management, office, supervisors and foreman, and skilled and unskilled workers, persons from Plant X, who have signed up for this in-plant human relations program. These people, of course, represent a cross-section of any American community and we will find ethnic minorities as well as those representing the majority. Leading the discussion is a moderator — and Dr. Lett, will serve as the resource consultant, the expert who will make some opening remarks about the 'anatomy of prejudice'. Then the other members of the panel here who are representatives of the plant's management and union will carry on the discussion.

EXPERT:

I want to talk about this anatomy of prejudice, this particular thing which makes a venture such as this an essential part of educational activity in any institution on the American scene. We are talking about a thing that is the essence of the American way of life. That is the matter of individual freedom, the right of an individual to an opportunity to play his complete role, to be an ethical part of the whole economic and social scheme of life in the American system.

Whether we call it civil rights or whether we discuss it in terms of a specific kind of program or legislative action; or whether we discuss it on the internal scene, we are still talking about the interplay between human beings in either teamwork or in conflict, or in some one of the degrees of human relationships in between.

Wherever we find the peculiar disease we call prejudice, there we find a disruption of that which would be the freewheeling, smooth operation of teamwork because prejudice is that which operates against teamwork.

I use the term 'prejudice' and we must make a very sharp distinction between that and the word 'discrimination,' which carries an entirely different connotation, but very frequently they are used together and in parallel connotation.

They are not the same. The one grows out of the other. Prejudice is something that happens within the emotional life of an individual as he responds to other people, to other things. Discrimination is that act which operates out of the prejudiced person's mind that caused him to inflict upon others some form of damage by restriction, limitation or other forms of ill treatment. Perhaps we can get the best illustration by this simple parallel example.

I have my prejudice which involves bright colors. I can't wear a bright yellow tie. A bright yellow tie is particularly offensive to me as part of my clothing because it makes me feel self-conscious; it makes me uneasy and unhappy. I can't wear the darn thing. That is my prejudice. It is simple. I get a lot of amusement out of it. I don't have to wear a yellow tie and nobody is going to pass a law to make me wear a yellow tie. Get that? That is my prejudice.

When that prejudice reaches the point of an obsession in which my dislike of yellow ties will reach that stage where I will begin destroying them wherever I see them, you know as well as I what happens to me immediately. Our laws are very simple, clear-cut and concise.

The first tie that I destroy gets lumps on my head and perhaps a little time on the State in the jailhouse. The second or third very definitely does, and I might wind up in the observation ward because our laws are very simple and direct in the matter of property.

My dislike, my prejudice, must not ever offend that which is your right, your right to wear a yellow tie or whatever you please.

But suppose another of my prejudices is against the skin color of another individual, or the way his name is spelled or the way he addresses his God. Suppose that is my prejudice. I have the same right to that prejudice as I have to the prejudice on yellow ties, but unfortunately our laws have not been as direct and concise as to what I may do in the operation of that prejudice.

So if my prejudice is against an individual because of the color of his skin or because of his religion or because of an ethnic group, I begin operating.

How? If that person comes in and works beside me on my job I make a kick against that. I won't have it. We will take the men out on strike. We will break up the business. If that man comes into a tavern or a restaurant and sits down beside me I see the management — Get him out. I don't like him.

You see, it operates not on the basis of my removing myself against that which is offensive; it operates on the basis of removing that which is offensive to me.

So here we will protect the one dollar necktie, which is offensive to me, but we let anybody interfere with the destiny of not one man, but of thousands of men and their children and their children's children because I don't like that particular thing.

There is the difference in this business of the disease of prejudice — the disease that operates in a discriminatory fashion. So we have to analyze this thing that we call prejudice — and here I would take at least fifteen minutes to analyze it.

First, that which is tradition. Most of us, decent people, nice people, operate upon that plane, not because we thought about it or studied it, or have any definite feelings or convictions about it, but we do it because we have been told that that is the way to do it. Other people do it, and it has been done for such a long time and we haven't time to worry about not being in any way upset about it — that is what I call tradition.

But in order to justify our following that path we call it tradition and we are much easier in conscience in having done it.

Every one of us is a victim of a combination of fear of various types, of insecurities, of anxieties—it is part of the process of living and growing up. We have those fears, all of us. Those of us who are strong enough to master the fears are masters of our fate and are destined to keep our relationships good between ourselves and other human beings.

The greater the fear, the greater we submit to those fears and the more we look for some kind of a crutch to adjust us to the things that happen. And so we find that the very fearful, the very insecure person, the person who always resorts to the scapegoat. He has to feel strong even by the fact that he can find someone else that he can kick around with impunity.

In the matter of miseducation and misinformation, it is important that we keep available to us every source of information. The pros and cons of every subject should be available so that we can always find an answer to these things that perplex us.

Unfortunately, the negative influence of the press, of literature, the emphasis in our reading which says that in the past

this has been an unpopular subject, so we don't pursue it. Fortunately, in very recent years, we are beginning to get both sides of the issue so that we can decide for ourselves.

And the fourth element is the element of exploitation by people who are smarter and know more than we do and who trade upon the frailties of human nature in order to achieve that which they desire.

This, then, gentlemen and ladies, is the problem; this is the thing we would attack. This is the disease, and the best way to treat it is in the good old American fashion of discussing it pro and con in all angles and all aspects, studying it and then getting to work as American citizens.

MODERATOR:

Before turning this over to the whole group let me just restate again, if a project such as the one you are witnessing this afternoon were to be conducted in a plant, there would be ten sessions on a much larger and extensive scale than the one we are having here today.

At each of these ten sessions there would be an expert or resource consultant who would qualify in a particular area of the field under discussion, and that individual would make a presentation of some twenty to thirty minutes, and in the course of his presentation he would open up avenues for discussion by the entire group. Our chairman, who served momentarily as an expert has given you, in miniature, capsule form, what he would do on a larger scale if he were playing the role of expert in a plant project at one of the ten meetings which would be held over a period of several months.

Having made his comments the expert now becomes a member of the panel and is

viewed as such by all of the participants in the group.

The procedure that we follow here is not one in which the members of the panel address questions to the expert which he then answers. The procedure we follow here is one in which each individual member of the panel, on the assumption that he has a point of view that is valid and should be heard, and is as good a point of view as anyone else's, has the right to express his views.

His views may be different from those of the other members of the panel and by encouraging that diversity in viewpoints we carry on the discussion and air our views, and hope that by so doing that that mutual understanding and respect of each other's point of view and differences will be reached.

You people here on the panel have just heard our expert talk on the matter of prejudice and discrimination. I wonder if there is anything that impressed you.

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we have any problems in this plant of ours. Just look around the table here; you see people of all religions, all races; we get along just fine. I don't see that there is anything here that we have to talk about.

MODERATOR:

I think that is a good question to raise. Are we just raising an entirely false issue here when we talk about prejudice and discrimination in the plant?

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: Perhaps we have some problems but what good is it going to do to sit around here and have a bull-session on them and waste all this time, when all the fellows can be on their jobs?

MODERATOR: Do you want to make a reply to that, Joe?

WORKER: I don't have a comment directly on that. But I want to know what to say to these guys that are moping off and won't work because the guy alongside them is a Negro. Maybe that's not a problem; but I know a couple of guys that keep saying 'I'm not going to work with niggers.'

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: I never heard anybody say that. I've been around the plant a long time and I never heard that remark.

WORKER: You ain't been where I've been.

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: Where have you been?

WORKER: Out in the washroom.

MODERATOR: Maybe we could get some specific cases, so that we can look at these opinions expressed in the light of some facts. Then perhaps we can tell more definitely whether there are any of these kinds of problems facing you all in this plant.

WORKER: Well, a fellow in my department left yesterday—the foreman left—and the man who has the most seniority in the department is a Negro and I think he is going to get the job. Well, if he gets the job I am going to quit because I am not going to work with a Negro.

MODERATOR: What do you say to that, Mr. Management?

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: This is the first time I ever heard that in the plant and I think it is un-American. Good Lord, man, what do you think you are doing?

WORKER: Well, I don't have to work with Negroes. Anyway, I can get a job someplace else.

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: Then you had better get one and get it fast.

WORKER: I am going to. I am just as smart as that Negro. There are a lot of people in that department that are better equipped than he is. He just happened to be there longer.

UNION

REPRESENTATIVE: There is no use getting ourselves roused up about prejudice in any plant. I have always disliked Jews because they make too much money. They are money-chasers.

MODERATOR: It looks as though we are getting our problems on the table. Anyone want to get anything else off his chest?

WORKER: In my community we had a problem yesterday. We have a swimming pool in our community and yesterday for the first time a group of Negro boys came in. You know how I feel about it? I don't mind Negroes if they know where they belong. You know these Negroes; they have their own smell, their peculiar attitudes, they put something in their hair; you know all that—and I have nothing against Negroes—but not in the swimming pool where I go swimming. I don't want to hurt their feelings, but I want them to go to another swimming pool.

WORKER: I just like to say that we Negroes were here before you ever got here and I am not saying where you ought to go. But if that is the way you feel about it maybe you had better go back there.

MODERATOR: It looks to me as if you are in the minority, Mr. Management? Do you still think there is no prejudice in this plant?

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: The only thing I know is my own department. I don't get around the plant much. But in my department we have some colored men working there and some Italian men working there and we get along just fine. And in our union meetings, good Lord, everybody has a chance to get up

and express themselves. Our union has an anti-discrimination clause in its charter. There is even one in the agreement that is being negotiated now with the plant. I just can't see it as a serious problem here. It might be somewhere else, but it sure doesn't happen here.

UNION

REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Management, you said there is no problem in your department; maybe not in your department, but do you know there isn't a single member of a minority group in the entire office staff of this whole corporation. There isn't even a foreigner up there. There isn't even a Negro there. They are all white Protestant girls in all the clerical staffs of this corporation.

ANOTHER
MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: As the public relations officer of this corporation, Mr. Moderator, I just question what we are doing here. It is true, of course, in every community that there are a few sore points, but isn't the important thing that there are so many good things happening? Shouldn't we talk about the places where we are working together and cooperating rather than, perhaps, bring out these places where people naturally will have different opinions and maybe make an appearance of conflict where really we are working together?

WORKER:

I think I agree with that. It is only a question of everyone knowing exactly where he belongs. The question would be only where people come in and throw themselves in my home and in my swimming pool. If they stay where they belong, then it is O.K. with me.

3rd

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: I have a problem that comes out of my own experience, not in this plant, but one

of the others. We have it here, too. I am trying to run a production occupation and I have got to fill places on the lines. I have a colored fellow who is well qualified, and I went to the other fellows on the line—they are all Whites—and I asked them if they would work with this colored fellow if I put him in here. They said, 'sure, we will work with him, but if he gets into trouble don't let him expect any help from us because we won't give it to him.' What am I going to do, put him on the job?

MODERATOR:

Do some of you others have any viewpoint about some of these questions raised here?

MANAGEMENT

REPRESENTATIVE: I think we have an expert here to give us the answer. Why doesn't he tell us what to do?

RESOURCE

CONSULTANT:

There are some areas of this discussion in which there is no expert; no one knows all the answers. We can only suggest certain courses. I believe that what you have already begun is the way that you are going to find the answers to this particular problem. It seems to me, first, that just from the discussion we have had thus far it is rather significant that the only people who are disliked are people who have been classified, as I said at the outset, as minority groups.

Someone doesn't want to work with Negroes; someone is concerned about Jews; someone is concerned about one or the other of the ethnic groups. And all of us who are concerned about how we are going to shut them out.

Now, what I think we need to do is to just go back again and review a little bit. Who are we? Who are they? What constitutes the difference? Priority as Americans? Who came first? Who has the best

kind of God? How are we going to classify that? Who is the best patriot? Who pays his taxes earlier than somebody else? How do we distinguish between who is 'we' and who is 'they'?

When we have decided that — when we have decided who has what right to shut the door on somebody else, then, maybe, we can find out how to shut the door and keep it locked; but, first, let us find out who has that right.

Who are we? I would like to put that question back on the floor, Mr. Moderator.

MODERATOR:

Does that satisfy you?

WORKER:

These fellows say 'Heck, I don't know why I have to work in the plant with them when they can't go to church with other people and to restaurants and to swimming pools; why do we have to have them work alongside of us?' I don't know how to answer it.

MODERATOR:

I wonder if I can break in here at the moment and suggest to the group that if we had time we could explore many of the issues that have been raised here and continue to explore them over a period of ten sessions. Obviously, when a group of thirty people can get together for an hour and a half once a week for ten weeks they do have an opportunity to explore them in a much more thorough way than we have here this afternoon. What we hope to do in this fifteen-minute preview is to give you some idea of what transpires during one segment of one of these Institute sessions.

Following this role-playing experiment, Dr. Goodwin Watson, Teachers College, Columbia University; Mr. Theodore S. Lisberger, Associate Manager, Employee Communication Department, General Electric Company, New York City; and Mr. James R. Massey, Employee Relations, International Harvester Company, Memphis, Ten-

nessee, joined with the members of the panel in analyzing and evaluating the "Teamwork in Industry" program, using the role-playing discussion as a point of departure.

Reviewing the stenotype report of this discussion, these conclusions regarding techniques for organization and results were made:

1. Techniques :

- a. A physical environment must be constructed which will be conducive to free, relaxed and productive communication between all participants; the use of name cards, securing a room removed from noise and other distractions; tables arranged in an informal manner; comfortable chairs provided.

- b. Not more than twenty-five to thirty participants should be selected, representing an ethnic, sex, occupation and group attitude-opinion cross-section of the plant.

Selection of the group members is particularly important, in order to stimulate the group as a whole to comprehend that prejudice is a real-life problem and that it is necessary to change these attitudes in work group and community. Therefore, some of the participants should be individuals who have been actual victims of prejudice and discrimination, who can provide the rest of the group with some first-hand accounts of their own experience. The total group can thereby be "emotionally" as well as logically convinced that democratic intergroup relations on a formal and person-to-person basis must be developed.

Opinion and attitude research also verifies the need for the majority of any group to be on the side of the "good and the right" if the bigots in the group are to be influenced to change their attitudes. In any program of this kind, therefore, the strongly-prejudiced people should be in the minority with pressure of members and prestige on the side of "brotherhood".

As Kurt Lewin points out:

"The re-educative process must be a process like a change in culture embracing all phases, changes in knowledge, values, and standards, changes of emotional attachments and needs and changes of everyday conduct, not piecemeal and independently of each other but within the framework of the individual's total life in the group.

"By anchoring his own conduct in something as large, substantial and superindividual as the culture of a group can the individual stabilize his new beliefs sufficiently to them,

immune from day-to-day fluctuations of moods and influence to which he, as an individual, is subject." *

2. Results of Such a Program:

- a. Provides participants with a cathartic, therapeutic experience, by giving them the opportunity to express their viewpoints regarding the problem of prejudice and discrimination, and their conceptions of various religious, social and nationality groups.
- b. Offers participants an excellent opportunity to get acquainted with and to understand the viewpoints of various religious, racial and nationality backgrounds regarding the problem of intergroup prejudice and discrimination.
- c. Provides plant personnel with an opportunity to get information about the broad area of intergroup relations.
- d. Creates a climate of readiness and acceptance in the plant and in segments of the community for social change leading to improved group relations.
- e. Group participants indicate a strong desire to continue discussion and group activities beyond the scheduled number of sessions.
- f. Several participants in each project raise the question: "What can we do specifically in the plant and in the community—how can we help?" As a result of several of the NCCJ in-plant projects, a number of people have gone out into community organizations and have contributed to development of an intergroup relations program in these local groups.
- g. Participants in such a program indicate that they have acquired new information regarding religious, racial and cultural differences and have also become acquainted with specific techniques for handling bigots and intergroup tension situations.
- h. Evidence indicates that the information gained at these meetings feeds into the various departments throughout a plant through lunch period bull sessions, union meetings, etc.—and out into the community via participants' families, friends and voluntary associations.
- i. One plant, as a result of the project, voted to organize a party inviting parents and children together to get acquainted with one another.

**Resolving Social Conflicts*, by Kurt Lewin, Harper and Brothers, N.Y., 1948.

- j. In one instance, a parent in one of the plant projects became enthused about a human relations course organized by one of the resource consultants and integrated into the curriculum of the local high school. As a result, this parent began a "one man" campaign to influence her parish parochial high school to adopt a similar course in human relations.

Before the conclusion of the analysis, these additional facts regarding the "Teamwork in Industry" educational program were brought forward in answer to questions raised by the industry and union leaders present in the audience:

- a. The "Teamwork in Industry" projects are concerned with intergroup relations problems only. The consultants present and the NCCJ do not pose as labor relations mediators.
- b. Within the area of intergroup relations, prejudice and discrimination, the project is concerned with relations between religious, racial and nationality groups. Emphasis may be given to one or another of these kinds of groups dependent upon the needs and interests of the plant and community in which this project is being held.
- c. To the question, "In light of the fact that the discussion at this Institute suggests that the results of these projects lead out into the community, attempting to influence the relationships in the general community, why should industry be charged with the responsibility of initiating and subsidizing this particular NCCJ program?" the following remarks were directed:
 1. Most plants have a community relations responsibility. Industry is part of a community. The industry's and community's welfare are mutual and for that reason prejudice and discrimination is as much industry's responsibility as it is the Rotary Club's or any other civic organization's.
 2. In facing any social problem each individual has to ask himself the question, "What can I do best?" and do it. If industry is to contribute to the total community learning within the plant, well and good. If the League of Women Voters can do the best job by influencing legislation, well and good. All of this builds better human relations and our obligation is to take a total community viewpoint rather than to ask, "What is in it for me?"

In closing it was emphasized that the "Teamwork in Industry" projects, to be successful, need the positive support of both management and the labor unions.

B. Labor's Approach To The Problem:

Louis Hollander, President of the New York State CIO Council and Vice President of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, described the approach utilized by the CIO in striving to assume labor's responsibility for strengthening our democratic society by securing equal status and equal rights for all workers, regardless of their racial, religious or nationality identification:

1. Any man who makes a contribution to the building of a better understanding between all the groups which make up America is making a contribution to the building of a stronger America.
2. Improving relations between groups is not a minority problem—you cannot separate Americans into minority and majority.
3. The CIO when it organizes, organizes workers in an industry, not whites or Negroes, Christians or Jews. When the union negotiates contracts to protect these workers, it bargains for pay and conditions on the basis of the job regardless of the race or religion of the person who holds the job.
4. Anti-discrimination policies are implemented in industry through specific contract terms; no segregation anywhere on the job; equal pay for equal work; no barriers to promotion on grounds of race or religion.
5. To enforce these terms, machinery is set up for investigating and acting on complaints whether against management or against brother union members.
6. At the same time a continuous process of education is necessary, most frequently through fair practices committees.
7. Labor considers discrimination on the job only a part of the overall problem of discrimination in housing, schools and other phases of community life.

C. Report From Management:

William C. Capes, President, Inland Steel Container Corporation, and formerly manager of industrial relations of Inland Steel Corporation, described efforts made by these companies to integrate minority workers into their work force. He offered the following recommendations:

1. Before embarking on an integration program, the plant management must define the objectives they wish to obtain. The plant leadership must be convinced of the "rightness" of these objectives, to believe the principles by which they are operating, determined that they have the power or ability of persuasion to see that their beliefs are fulfilled.

2. The problem of integration of minority groups must have a very high priority. Top management has to recognize the problem.
3. Management should, if at all possible, have the complete co-operation of the labor union involved.
4. One of the great obstacles in the efforts of unions and industry toward integration is for both to realize fully the framework of the industrial society in which both operate. (A mill or factory is as definite a society as is the community in which it operates.) As a society, there are customs, traditions and mores which must be respected and, in some cases, complied with when any change affecting personnel is contemplated.
5. One of the first steps to be taken following the exploratory planning phase is a clear statement of policy.
6. This policy statement cannot be put into effect, however, unless it is by those who are affected by it. An educational program no doubt will be necessary.
7. Methods of gaining compliance with the policy must be selected on the basis of the social history of a plant. (The older the plant, the more searching the examination must be for plant traditions will be more rooted.)
8. In addition to the plant community attitude, those instituting an integration program must look at the community outside the plant — its customs, mores, etc. One may find that in accomplishing the task properly a community educational job is in order simultaneously with, or before, the plant program.
9. Once the primary integration has been put into effect the plant management must check carefully to make sure that the minority group members are progressing normally in all of the activities of the work force. Questions such as: "How fast should a man be promoted?" "Are the members of minority groups engaging in social activities?" "Are they engaging in social activities within their departments?" If you have one group progressing at one norm and another group progressing at another, one may find that instead of integrating a work force, one has created two separate groups within the work force.
10. The upgrading of minority groups within the work force becomes relatively easy when one is able to convince those affected that upgrading will be more profitable for them than any threat to their present security the promotion might

represent. This is particularly true when upgrading is into the supervisory ranks.

11. In cases of upgrading in groups when status is defined, such as foreman groups, or white collar workers, when a minority group member is promoted, these groups tend to integrate the newcomer into all of their group activities as a measure to protect their own group status.
12. Among highly skilled technicians, technical competition alone seems sufficient for acceptance.
13. One of the hurdles to the hiring and upgrading of minority groups members in plant is the fear of those charged with the responsibility that they will make mistakes in carrying out the integration program. No mistake in procedure will have too great a consequence. If the method fails, stop it and try another. The mere fact of trying will produce greater good than harm.
14. Mr. Caples, in concluding his address, declared, "I think that actually there are no obstacles in hiring and upgrading that are insurmountable. And I think that there are many that are not even large. It really is more or less like worrying. The things, when you get to them, are never as bad as you thought they were going to be."

III. STEPS AHEAD

Following this presentation, the delegates to the Institute analyzed the "Teamwork in Industry" intergroup education program and as a result of this analysis the following resolution was offered by Mr. Malcolm Ross, Editor, University Press, the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida. We quote from the stenotype report of the proceedings including additional comments from other group chairmen.

MR. ROSS: We offer the following resolution. We offer it on the premise that the "Teamwork in Industry" project, which is now several years old, is beginning to get out of swaddling clothes; is making as its objective many national plans — none in the South, I regret to say; and it is having relationships, of necessity, with two main groups — top management and labor.

We had in our group both representatives, and we feel that going to the top internationals who have advisory committees against discrimination who are doing a good job on it would be a good thing.

This organization here is spelled out of any intervention of any negotiations on wages or hours. It must have the sufferance of both management and the union in the plant. Therefore, in consideration thereof, we suggest to the Labor-Management Commission that a series of meetings be held in New York next year; that the first one be an invitation to the advisory committees on anti-discrimination, and that AF of L and the CIO and others, if there are any, to the heads of committees on anti-discrimination in the internationals, to educational directors of the internationals, that they meet with the members of Labor-Management Committee which represents a cross-section of labor and management and has some experience and some know-how in how to conduct the seminars; and by that means the top management of American labor be gotten in on behalf of this project.

And that conference be followed by a second meeting with the Labor-Management Committee in which management — top management would be there.

This to be followed by a third combined meeting of the people in charge of anti-discrimination in the unions and management. And that thereby you would eliminate any lingering suspicions and that it would be perfectly crystal clear that this was an added educational tool to their own anti-discrimination program whether in labor or management. We felt very strongly about that and voted it unanimously.

MR. JAMES L. MACWITHEY, Assisant Vice President of Public Relations, Bristol-Myers Company, New York City: Our group was very, very strongly of the opinion that a program such as the NCCJ "Teamwork in Industry" should be brought home to more people. And, of course, we discussed the question of getting it to the plants and this is the suggestion that was made:

That the NCCJ hold a school, maybe for a period of, say, five days, in which both members of industry and top labor in the plant could be brought to a certain designated city and given a full course so that they could go back and talk to their top management in trying to get their program initiated.

MR. LEWIS COREY, Director of Education, Butcher Workmen Educational and Benevolent Association, Chicago, Illinois: It was not merely to eliminate suspicion that we suggested separate initial meetings of labor unions and management, followed by a combined meeting. It was primarily to get together and work out techniques as to just how this work was to be carried on and, above all, to get a discussion of the techniques of cooperation between union and management because if we are going to go ahead in industry on this basis we can't do it with management alone or with the unions alone. It has to be a joint, cooperative effort of these two, and this series of meetings would work out the methods of doing that.

This keen look at our approach, an educational approach to the human relations problem, and more specifically, the problem of intergroup prejudice and discrimination calls attention to the fact that any program designed to do a job of social change of this kind — must be carefully scrutinized and developed on the basis of sound scientific method.* Although there is an increasing tendency within the individual social science disciplines to integrate their research findings into a more comprehensive coordinate approach, "the science of man", many intergroup relations specialists and action organizations still are not utilizing to advantage the available tools of all the disciplines in their program activities.

Dr. Alfred Marrow, President of Harwood Manufacturing Company, of New York City, speaking to this point at the Institute, said: "On the one hand there is everywhere in the land a contingent of good neighbors laboring at good relations between different ethnic and other groups; members of organizations like NCCJ.

*Data from Arnold Rose's "Union Solidarity" study, published by the University of Minnesota, 1952 (see page 187) dramatizes the need for developing sound "experience centered" programs rather than the usual lectures, films and classroom-centered courses when working with laboring groups.

"On the other hand, there is completely separate but equally energetic contingent in quite a different world — that of social science. The tragedy is that these efforts have been separate and not united.

"The crucial 'know-how' resulting from scientific studies is far from having become the common possession of the good will groups."

Dr. Marrow pointed out that primitive irrational beliefs still stand as barriers to true achievement of world brotherhood. Thorough self-evaluation must be pursued by intergroup relations organizations in order to "overcome the hard core of resistance that seeks to delay changes." He urged that organizations such as NCCJ should continue to pursue this self-examination of methods and goals by continuously bringing together social scientists and "lay men of good will," to plan valid programs and organize reliable strategy.

In discussing the "Teamwork in Industry" educational program he emphasized that the "educate away prejudice" proponents need to ask themselves such questions as: "How dependable is knowledge as a change factor?" He reemphasized that:

- a. knowing the facts does not necessarily change the attitude;
- b. group mores are more influential than classes and lectures;
- c. action is needed by everyone concerned to change attitudes and behavior patterns — not the action carried on by the speaker alone. Learning does not occur unless the learner is actively involved in the problem and participates in the solution.

This statement, of course, underlined the necessity for using a broadening multiple-angle approach to implement social change and group attitudes. It is not sufficient "to educate for good human relations". One must be concerned that the educational process is not limited to "words" alone. Stirring lectures do not suffice. For this reason the group technique, combining group-discussion and study with group action, provides one very effective way to approach this area in many industrial and community relations problems. Social research, as Dr. Marrow asserted, points the need for a direct experience method. And, like a plant self-survey, or a community self-survey, any group self-analysis, by its very nature, must involve the participating group:

- a. in a group experience which provides each individual with some sense of prestige, new identity and purpose;
- b. in a process of defining and redefining individual and group ideas and attitudes regarding their role, other's roles and their relationships with each other and with each group in whatever organizational setting which they are dealing with.

So, if it be an industrial plant, the individuals and the total group, first, through continued interaction with one another receive certain satisfactions in their relationship with one another. Having others look upon Joe as a member of "that committee from the union and the head office making a survey" gives Joe a sense of purpose and a new image of himself. He belongs. He is a valuable member of the plant's society. There are "psychic" satisfactions.

Secondly, Joe, and Sam, Jean George and Doris — participating for the first time in the process of "looking at the forces which control them", what makes their work, department of their company tick — is a new thrilling, maturing and challenging experience. It is, in a measure, as the atomic scientist must feel when he comprehended for the first time that he could control molecular fission. It gives a man, especially a man bogged down with mechanistic routine, as a factory worker, an exciting sense of power and responsibility when he realizes that he and the rest of the gang are questioning "the way things are run" or "the way we act around here". This new experience is, of course, the kind of living lesson which "old management" philosophy fears and takes great pains to avoid — the realization among workers that they wish to participate in the force that rules them. True — this is the power which sparks revolutions and strikes. Just as true, however, this is the force which gives men drive and ambition, high courage and a love for life.

Just as true, this is the force which strengthens a democratic society — resisting full force any attempts to undermine group government.

And true, this is the force which brings change into society — destroys slums, gives minorities the will to be recognized and respected, overthrows corrupt political machines, develops new systems of teaching and learning and conquers new physical and spiritual worlds.

A concrete simple example: A group from management and labor meeting together weekly to discuss problems of integrating minority groups works into various departments in the company. Some workers raise the question: "Why aren't there any Negroes working in the office, despite the fact that probably 30% of the work force in the mill are Negroes?" Some explanations, some alibis, some talk of "Who's running this place?" Group discussion, group planning, group initiative in discussing with white workers in office. Result: for the first time in the company's thirty-five years of operation, Negroes are now working in the office.

Intergroup ideas and attitudes are being modified. Plant workers are realizing that they have a stake in their company and can con-

tribute to its welfare and progress. New relationships are developing between labor and management. The bargaining table no longer holds the monopoly on union-management associations. And, equally important to all of these factors, individuals are developing new human relations skills by doing, new respects for other majority and minority groups by working with them and for them.

When human relations becomes their problem rather than the personnel manager's, or the city council's problem — a program ceases to be manipulation and is transformed into that social process which Kurt Lewin refers to as "dynamic group change".

Top industrial management and organized labor leaders are accepting with increasing conviction the need for such an educational program to supplement a legislative program in the area of intergroup relations and civil rights enforcement. This fact is evidenced by statements made in the final feedback summary presented by the panel of the work sessions chairmen at the closing meeting of the NCCJ "Teamwork in Industry" Institute held at Rutgers University.

Joseph L. Bustard, Assistant Commissioner, New Jersey Commission Against Discrimination, raised this issue when he asked the chairmen to report their groups' decisions regarding the relationship between civil rights legislation and intergroup education.

For documentation, the following excerpt is drawn from the transcribed report of these proceedings:

JOSEPH L. BUSTARD: Yesterday morning, in the kickoff session, the same old cliché was expressed — I don't think it was meant the way it was stated — but that is that you can't legislate against prejudice. I am wondering if these panels got into a discussion of that because in many of the states or in many of the areas of the country, one of the arguments used against legislation is that you can't legislate against prejudice. Now, I raise that because knowing most of the commissioners in the states with FEPC I have yet to find one of those people that even thought you couldn't legislate against prejudice.

In other words, I am raising the purpose of legislation.

JOSEPH J. MORROW, Director of Personnel Relations, Pitney-Bowes Company, Stamford, Connecticut: We discussed that very thoroughly in both of our conferences and I think we all agreed that legislation by itself isn't the ultimate answer. The ultimate answer is education.

However, education and legislation go hand in hand. Without one the other isn't very effective.

As far as legislation goes, it was brought out in our conferences that you can just imagine the high degree of illiteracy that we would have in this country, if it weren't for school laws necessitating that children go to school for a certain number of years. There is no doubt about it, that children would drop out by the wayside long before they reached the age of fourteen, fifteen or sixteen.

There is no doubt about the fact that legislation is necessary; first, in order to implement education and give authority to people trying to sell industry against discrimination.

MALCOLM ROSS: As an example of where education acted but did not overcome prejudice, I would like to bring up the South.

Let us take the Wage and Hour situation which, for all practical purposes, met the same resistance as FEPC meets in the South today. There is a prejudice against Negroes receiving higher wages on the economic level and intersocial levels, too.

There is a prejudice against cooks receiving more than three dollars a week or Negro workers receiving much money.

Now, the Wage and Hours law, being national, extended to the South. It acted against prejudice and wholly successfully so. It has improved the economy of the South.

And our group, while this illustration doesn't come from the group, I don't want to wrong them — I think they felt legislation is a tool needed to bring education.

Legislation and education should go apace, but the strengthening hand of legislation will bring the few recalcitrants in and bring up the level of the standards of the country.

JAMES L. MACWITHEY: I just wanted to say that I favored education but I must admit that I am changing a little bit — I felt very much in favor of education rather than legislation.

We kicked it around in our discussion group too, and I am pretty much convinced now that we have to have the legislation first. I think from the examples we received that legislation and education go hand in hand.

F. W. BRENNAN, Industrial Relations Director, Revere Copper and Brass Company, Chicago, Illinois: I might say, too, that that question occupied more time in our two conferences than any other. Beyond any doubt, the majority in the group favored legislation. There were a few who felt that education would accomplish it — would accomplish the objective.

However, there was also a greater majority who thought that a combination of both would be best and we had some question of which came first — you might term it a conditioning of the mind.

One gentleman expressed the opinion that possibly the moral approach to it would be to make known your purpose a period of as much as ten years in advance. Lay it on the table with no ulterior motives and set about to condition people's minds for legislation you hope to get ten years hence.

That was a little longer than the accepted period, although, again, as mentioned by other chairmen here, it is felt that the combination was greatly to be desired.

JOHN H. EIKENBERG, Vice President in Charge of Industrial Relations, Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., Rome, New York: We heard about attitudes and problems that existed, but until the last few minutes we didn't hear too much about what we are going to do about these problems. We did hear several resolutions that were made; we did hear that NCCJ is doing a fine job and should expand its activity in certain directions, but are there any more approaches, techniques that have developed within your various discussions as a result of these two-day meetings?

RUSSELL GREENMAN, Director of Personnel Relations, General Cable Corporation, New York City: Our group had a number of alternative suggestions.

One originated from the secretary of the group who is himself a distinguished labor leader and active in combatting discrimination throughout unions generally and, particularly, in his own. And there were some in our group — again, anything but unanimous — there were some who favored authoritative action and pointed out in the CIO Steel Workers Union that where there were resentment and resistance towards integration, the union itself, under its constitution and by-laws and operating rules, had delegated to its international officers power to crack down.

There were others who pointed out, when there was discrimination, in the sense of segregation in certain school and certain areas — certain parochial schools — the head of the church used his authority to put an end to it.

The consensus of our group, again to put it in fancy language, was that problems of intergroup tensions are mutual factors and the different forms of prejudices called for different methods in handling them.

Sometimes, it has to be authoritative — wielding of the big stick; and in others an individual type of educational technique — the NCCJ projects for industry and perhaps similar projects for labor people alone and in the community. As far as the legislative approach is concerned, the secretary of our group who had just come

from the two major conventions pointed out that he and his colleagues had been unable to educate sufficiently the legislators who are writing the platform to induce them to propose legislation.

And while this was not the consensus of the group, the question may well be raised, if it be so necessary, to educate legislators to introduce and work for the passage of bills. Perhaps the real necessity is to educate their constituents, convince them of the need for combatting prejudice. And if the constituents were educated to the degree to advocate legislation to put an end to discrimination, perhaps the millenium would arrive and we wouldn't need legislation at all.

JOHN C. WARD, Bridgeport Brass Company, Bridgeport, Connecticut: Our group spent quite a lot of time on this question this morning: Where do we go from here and how could we make further progress ahead, and I would like to summarize it briefly in accordance with your question here.

We took it from three angles. One was what can top management do?; second, what can unions do?; and, third, what can the NCCJ itself do?

And, starting with top management, it was our feeling in our group, for the most part, that top management, in addition to adopting a non-discriminatory policy and putting it into effect, can also do some very helpful things along the lines of going to managements of other big companies and talking to them about it; in other words, not just acting within their own plant but trying to get other companies to adopt similar programs.

Second, we felt that management could do much more in the community than they have done on this problem; that they could take a more active part on a community-wide basis wherever the problem exists.

Then, on the unions, we had several suggestions there. One thing we brought out was the fact that unions tend to think primarily in terms of FEPC and they don't think sufficiently in terms of education as such, and of cooperative projects with management on the program.

Second, the feeling was that unions — this was widespread and I think somewhat agreed to — that unions, once they get the FEPC will drop the matter and won't follow through and use it the way they should. Of course, most of these FEPC laws require that an investigation can be made only on an actual complaint. If the unions don't follow through there, and where there is real discrimination

and no complaint registered, there is no value in having the law on the books if there is no followup on it.

The third feeling of the group was the need to have an end to labor's hostile attitude towards management so that there could be a more cooperative attitude towards an approach on this matter of discrimination.

Then, in regard to NCCJ it felt, at least in our group, we weren't all unanimous that the program that NCCJ is sponsoring is perfect. There was considerable discussion about phases of the project that needed examination, and the necessity to improve it in various ways.

One thing that was expressed was that some of these employers that participated in these programs come out and say — once they are outside the room — "Well, we said in that conference room what we should have said and now that we are outside we feel the same as before."

That is a problem that needs to be examined and ways found to overcome it.

Then there was a feeling expressed too that some union locals are not wholly sold on the program — there is no opposition to it. They don't go along with it wholeheartedly and, in fact, some of them are not for it. There is need for work to be done along that line.

And finally, on the "Teamwork in Industry" program itself is a need to have a more flexible program which can be adapted to the particular plant and its particular problems and not be so rigid that you can't adjust it to meet the problems that exist in the plant where you are trying to put this program into effect.

RUSSELL GREENMAN: May I add something? The obvious one is, of course, "Set an example. Do something about it, hire these folks, promote these folks, help them to make good — that is, perhaps, the most important of all.

I am called to represent a company that does that — and we are proud of the result and we hope that example will convince other people that it is desirable and profitable and right.

We can see as we read these comments from representatives of labor and management discussing together their mutual problems and mutual programs in the area of intergroup and human relations that the group process, the process of change in attitudes and viewpoints through interpersonal interactions in face-to-face groups was evidenced in the above account of the work session discussions. Two polar points of view were modified by discussion. The conclusion resulting was the need for a combination educative-legislative approach to the problem of civil rights in employment. Where many

union leaders had been of the opinion that the force of the law is sufficient unto itself—many management leaders had long opposed FEPC laws as undemocratic and ineffectual.

Following a two-day discussion, it appears that a majority from both groups had arrived at a typical group decision—a modification of extreme points of view.

If social agencies, as well as our human relations centers in various colleges and universities throughout the country, might heed the suggestion of Dr. Marrow, calling together at regular intervals "laymen of good will" from the great industrial institutions of our American scene, to share the discussion table with social scientists and social actionists, considering their mutual aims, their mutual goals, it would be possible to plan a mutual program to transform from once vague longings and Utopian daydreams into an accomplished reality.

The concept of "teamwork" implies equality. The concept of equality implies democratic government and society. Democratic society implies group leadership and group action. And group leadership and group action implies "Teamwork". The cycle is complete.

When this cycle ceases to be theoretical and becomes actual from the very grass roots in every institution of our culture, including schools, colleges, churches, industry and labor, we will be ready to assume our world leadership responsibilities with confidence and principle and look forward with sincere faith in moving nearer to the paramount goal of us all—peace and world brotherhood.

"To change a culture from autocracy or any other political and total cultural way of life, the cultural change must be a change in the 'total cultural atmosphere', not merely a change of single items. For a cultural change in regard to a specific item, for example, Negro prejudice, will have to be able to stand up against the weight of the thousand and one items of the rest of the culture which tend to turn the conduct back to its old pattern." *

**"Resolving Social Conflicts"*, by Kurt Lewin, Harper and Brothers, N.Y., 1948, pp. 45-46.

SECOND ANNUAL INSTITUTE—Teamwork in Industry

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

July 31-August 1, 1952

PROGRAM

- Thursday, July 31, 1952* *How can the Industrial Citizen meet his Group Relations Responsibility in the Plant and Community?*
- 10:00 A. M. SESSION I
- Chairman: KENNETH D. JOHNSON, Dean, New York School of Social Work
- Invocation: THE REVEREND JOSEPH CANTILLON, Institute of Industrial Relations
St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.
- Welcome: ALBERT E. MEDER, Jr., Dean of the University
- Address: *"Prejudice — Industry's No. 1 Human Relations Problem."*
EVERETT R. CLINCHY, President
National Conference of Christians and Jews
- Address: *"Industry's Responsibility for Strengthening Group Relations in the Plant."*
- Address: LEE H. BRISTOL, President, Bristol-Myers Co.
"The Group Relations Responsibility of Labor Organizations."
JACOB S. POTOFSKY, General President
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America
- Luncheon 12:00 SESSION II
- Chairman: CLARENCE A. PETERS, Director, Commission on Labor-Management Organizations, National Conference of Christians and Jews
- Address: *"Industry's Opportunity for Improving Community Group Relations."*
MALCOLM S. FORBES, President, Forbes Magazine
- 2 - 3:30 P. M. SESSION III
- Chairman: The Moderators Meet the Experts
HAROLD A. LETT, Assistant Director, Division Against Discrimination, New Jersey State Department of Education
- Moderators:
- J. MARTIN KLOTSCHKE
President, Wisconsin State College
- MAX WOLFF
Research Associate, Teachers College
- DANIEL S. ANTHONY
Director
Newark, NCCJ
- H. CURTIS MIAL
Executive Director
N. J. State Citizens' Council, Inc.

Interrogators:

JAMES R. MASSEY
International Harvester Company

GOODWIN WATSON
Columbia University

VERNON M. WELSH
General Electric Co.

WILLIAM E. VICKERY
Director
Center for Community Studies
N.Y. State Teachers College

VIRGIL L. BORDER
Director

National Conference of Christians and Jews
St. Louis, Mo.

3:30 - 5:30 P. M.

SESSION IV

Conferences

Question: *"What are the Group Relations Problems affecting Plant and Community Morale?"*

Chairman: WILLIAM B. MALONEY, Manager, Employee Relations

Secretary: Esso Standard Oil Company
MALCOLM ROSS, Editor, University Press,
University of Miami

CONFERENCE **A***Chairman:*

F. W. BRENNAN: *Industrial Relations Manager, Revere Copper and Brass Company, Chicago, Ill.*

Secretary:

S. VINCENT WILKING: *Consultant in Labor Relations and Personnel Administration*

Consultants:

BRENDAN SEXTON: *Director Education UAW-CIO — Detroit, Michigan.*

IRVINE L. H. KERRISON: *Chairman, Labor Program, Institute of Management & Labor Relations, Rutgers University*

JOHN H. SLAGLE: *Director, Employee and Community Relations Division, Jackson & Perkins, Newark, New York.*

HIRAM HALL: *Personnel Director, Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., New York City*

AUSTIN E. FINNESSY: *Labor Relations Supervisor, International Minerals and Chemicals Corp., Chicago, Ill.*

CAROLINE K. SIMON: *Commissioner, New York State Commission Against Discrimination*

WILLIAM J. E. CRISSEY: *Asst. Professor of Psychology, Queens College*

RALPH B. NOVAK: *Executive Vice President, American Newspaper Guild*

JAMES M. EAGAN: *Director, Northeastern Division, National Conference of Christians and Jews*

IRWIN E. KLASS: *Editor, Federation News, Official Organ of the Chicago Federation of Labor*

JAMES D. DUNLOP: *Employee Relations Administrator, American Cyanamid Company*

HARRY C. BREDEMEIER: *Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology, New Jersey College for Women*

DANIEL A. DALY: *Chief of Enforcement Bureau, New York State Dept. of Labor*

CONFERENCE **B***Chairman:*

WINTHROP STEVENS: *Director of Industrial Relations, F. C. Huyck & Sons, Rensselaer, N.Y.*

Secretary:

LEWIS COREY: *Director of Education, Butcher Workmen Educational & Benevolent Asso.*

Consultants:

THEODORE W. KHEEL: *Impartial Chairman of Transit Industry, New York City*

JOHN W. RILEY: *Chairman, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University*

R. C. EHRMAN: *Manager, Employee Relations, General Electric X-Ray, Milwaukee, Wis.*

JOSEPH J. MORROW: *Director of Personnel Relations, Pitney-Bowes, Stamford, Conn.*

R. A. WENTWORTH: *Service Sup't., E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., N. Brunswick, N.J.*

NOAH C. A. WALTER: *Executive Director, The Negro Labor Committee, U.S.A.*

SIMON MARCSON: *Department of Social Affairs, United Nations*

THE REV. JOSEPH CANTILON: *Institute of Industrial Relations, St. Peter's College, Jersey City, N. J.*

J. MARTIN KLOTSCHKE: *President, Wisconsin State College*

DAN DODSON: *Director, Center of Human Relations, New York University*

W. R. WALTON: *Director of Public Relations, Studebaker Corporation*

JACK STEARNS: *Educational Field Representative, New York State Commission Against Discrimination*

CONFERENCE

C

Chairman:

ROBERT F. NELSON: *Vice President, American Type Founders, Inc., Elizabeth, N.J.*

Secretary:

FRANCIS C. SHANE: *Committee on Civil Rights, CIO*

Consultants:

ORA HIGGINS: *Spiegel's, Chicago, Ill.*

WILLIAM V. MACHAVER: *Training Director, Johnson & Johnson, N. Brunswick, N.J.*

LOUIS PAUL NESTEL: *Labor Relations, New York*

DOROTHY W. GRAF: *Office Manager, Crucible Steel Company, N.Y.C.*

RAY W. FUHRHOP: *Industrial Relations Manager, Socony Vacuum Oil Co., Paulsboro, N.J.*

RUSSELL L. GREENMAN: *Director of Personnel Relations, General Cable Corp., New York City*

HERMAN SIROTA: *Manager, Locals 166, 222, I.L.G.W.U., Newark, N.J.*

H. CURTIS MIAL: *Executive Director, N.Y. State Citizens' Council, Inc.*

JOSEPH B. GITTLER: *Dept. of Sociology, Iowa State College*

KENNETH B. CLARK: *Dept. of Psychology, City College, N.Y.*

L. K. BISHOP: *Vice President and Director, Central Division, National Conference of Christians & Jews, Chicago, Ill.*

MORGAN UPTON: *Chairman, Department of Psychology, Rutgers University*

CONFERENCE

D

Chairman:

JAMES L. MacWITHEY: *Asst. Vice President of Public Relations, Bristol-Myers Co., New York City*

Secretary:

JULIUS A. THOMAS, *Director of Industrial Relations, Urban League, N.Y.*

Consultants:

THOMAS ATTERBURY, *Personnel Manager, Birds-Eye Division, General Foods Corp., Rochester, N.Y.*

CLARENCE C. MARTIN, *Industrial Relations Manager, Sloane-Blabon Corp., Trenton, N.J.*

ROBERT M. FREHSE, *Executive Secretary, N. C. C. J., Detroit, Mich.*

HARRY KRANZ, *Legislative Director, New Jersey State Council, CIO.*

PHYLLIS PAGE BRADSHAW, *Associate Extension Specialist, Rutgers University*

GEORGE DONAHUE, *National Director, Association of Catholic Trade Unionists*

HAROLD A. LETT, *Assistant Director, Division against Discrimination, New Jersey State Department of Education*

JOHN H. SLOCUM, *Secretary, Board of Trustees, State University of New York*

MARTIN P. CHWOROWSKY, *Director, Albert M. Greenfield Center for Human Relations*

University of Pennsylvania

VIRGIL L. BORDER, *Director, National Conference of Christians & Jews, St. Louis, Mo.*

LEO BEREK, *U.S. Navy Supply Activities, Brooklyn, New York*

THOMAS Q. GILSON, *Chairman, Management Program, Institute of Management & Labor Relations, Rutgers University*

CONFERENCE E

Chairman:

JOHN C. WARD, *Industrial Relations Director*, Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

Secretary:

ALBERT K. HERLING, *Executive Assistant to the President*, United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers, International Union

Consultants:

JOHN J. O'BRIEN, *Industrial Relations Director*, Cluett, Peabody & Co., Troy, N.Y.

R. H. AUSTIN, *Personnel Director*, International Business Machines Corp, Endicott, N.Y.

JOSEPH H. VERTREES, *Prof. of Industrial Relations*, Rutgers University

R. W. EIDSON, *Industrial Relations Dept.*, American Can Co., N.Y.C.

GEORGE MOSKOWITZ, *Director, Labor Relations Section*, Research Institute of America, Inc., N.Y.C.

MYRA BLAKESLEE, *Director of Education*, New Jersey State Commission against Discrimination

LEO PERLIS, *National Director, Community Service Committee*, CIO

MAX WOLFF, *Research Associate*, Teachers College, Columbia University

RAYMOND A. KATZELL, *Director, Psychological Services Center*, Syracuse University

MAURICE TERRY, *Director*, National Conference of Christians & Jews, Milwaukee, Wisc.

JOHN P. NICHOLS, *Labor Staff Representative*, Community Welfare Council of Milwaukee County

CHARLES B. LAKIN, *Big Brothers of America*

CONFERENCE F

Chairman:

STANLEY H. RUFTENBERG, *Director*, Dept. of Education & Research, CIO

Secretary:

J. W. BIRD, *Manager, College Relations Division*, R.C.A.-Victor, Camden, N.J.

Consultants:

ORVILLE C. JONES, *Education Director*, Ohio CIO Council

VICTOR K. ONORATO, *U.S. Naval Supply Activities*, Brooklyn, New York

EMORY A. COUGHLIN, *Director of Personnel Relations*, Cluett, Peabody & Co.

D. J. HANOR, *Director, Personnel & Public Relations*, Sterling-Winthrop Research Institute, Rensselaer, N. Y.

JACK SCHUYLER, *Assistant Supervisor, Mutual Security Agency Project*, Rutgers University

WILLIAM WALKER, *Director of Safety and Training*, American Smelting & Refining Co., Perth Amboy, N. J.

RHEA ECKEL, *Center for Field Services*, New York University

WILLIAM E. VICKERY, *Director, Center for Community Studies*, New York State College for Teachers

KENNETH JOHNSON, *Dean*, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University

LLOYD L. SCHRADER, *Manager Industrial Relations*, Heyden Chemical Corp., Garfield, N. J.

DONALD G. MILLAR, *President*, Greenfield Tap and Dye Co.

OTTO A. JIRIKOWIC, *Organizer, Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee*, Milwaukee, Wis.

5:30 P.M. Open House Reception
 Dinner meeting—
 7:00 P. M. SESSION V
 Chairman: JOSEPH J. MORROW, Director of Personnel
 Relations
 Pitney-Bowes Company
 Address: "Obstacles to the Program of Hiring and Upgrading
 Minority Group Workers."
 WILLIAM G. CAPLES, President, Inland Steel
 Container Corp.

Friday, August 1, 1952

9:00 A.M. SESSION VI
 Question: Group Relations Projects and Their Possible
 Impact on the Plant and Community.
 Study Group Conferences

Luncheon 12:00

SESSION VII
 Chairman: MARY G. ROEBLING, President, Trenton
 Trust Co.

Address: "Economic Consequences of Strengthened Group
 Relations in Industry."

ALFRED MARROW, President, Harwood Man-
 ufacturing Co.

Address: "Equal Opportunity on the Job and Labor Union
 Contracts"

LOUIS HOLLANDER, President, New York
 State CIO Council

3:00 P. M.

SESSION VIII

Summary of Discussion Conferences

Chairman: WILLIAM B. MALONEY

Secretary: MALCOLM ROSS

Panel:

F. W. BRENNAN, Chairman

WINTHROP STEVENS, Chairman

ROBERT F. NELSON, Chairman

JAMES L. MACWITHEY, Chairman

JOHN C. WARD, Chairman

STANLEY H. RUTTENBERG, Chairman

Interrogators:

JOHN H. EIKENBERG

Vice President in charge of Industrial
 Relations

Revere Copper and Brass, Inc.

CAROLINE K. SIMON

Commissioner

New York State Commission Against Dis-
 crimination

JOSEPH L. BUSTARD

Assistant Commissioner

Division Against Discrimination

State of New Jersey, Department of
 Education

CURRENT READINGS **IN** **INTERGROUP AND HUMAN RELATIONS**

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Bakke, E. Wight | Organization and the Individual
New Haven: Labor and Management Center,
Yale University, 1952, 55 pp. |
| Brookes, Edgar H. | We Come of Age
Johannesburg, South African Institute of
Race Relations, 1950, 21 pp. |
| Chamberlain, Neil W. | Management in Motion
New Haven: Labor and Management Center,
Yale University, 1950, 124 pp. |
| Chase, Stuart | Roads to Agreement: Successful Methods in
the Science of Human Relations
New York: Harper Bros., 1951, 250 pp. |
| Cooper, A. M. | How to Supervise People — 3rd Edition
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1952, 254 pp. |
| Dubin, R. | Human Relations in Administration: The
Sociology of Organization. New York: Pren-
tice-Hall, 1951, 573 pp. |
| Hoslett, Schuyler Dean (ed.) | Human Factors in Management
Harper & Bros., 1951, 327 pp. |
| Jaques, E. | The Changing Culture of a Factory
London: Tavistock Publ., 1951, 341 pp. |
| Judon, Elijah | Business Be Damned
New York, Henry Schuman, 1952, 267 pp. |
| Learned, Edmund P.,
Ulrich, D. N. | Executive Action
Cambridge: Howard University Graduate
School of Business Administration, 1951,
218 pp. |
| Booz, Donald | |
| Marrow, Alfred J. | Living without Hate: Scientific Approaches
to Human Relations, New York, Harper &
Bros., 1951, 262 pp. |
| McLarney, Wm. J. | Management Training
Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1952,
358 pp. |
| Miller, Delbert C. &
Form, Wm. T. | Industrial Sociology: An Introduction to the
Sociology of Work Relations
New York: Harper & Bros., 1951, 896 pp. |

**CURRENT READINGS
IN
INTERGROUP AND HUMAN RELATIONS**

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, PERIODICALS, ARTICLES

- | | |
|---|--|
| National Institute of Industrial Psychology | Joint Consultation in British Industry
London: Staples Press, 1952, pp. 276 |
| National Institute of Industrial Psychology | The Foreman
London: Staples Press, 1951 |
| Parker, W. E. & Kleemeier, R. W. | Human Relations in Supervision: Leadership in Management
New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951, 472 pp. |
| Piffner, John M. | The Supervision of Personnel: Human Relations in the Management of Men
New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951, 454 pp. |
| Rose, Arnold | Union Solidarity
Minneapolis, The University of Minnesota Press, 1952, 205 pp. |
| Rouon, G. | Industrial Relations and Race Relations
London: South African Institutes of Race Relations, 1952, 28 pp. |
| Schuster, G. | Christianity and Human Relations in Industry
London: The Epworth Press, 1951, 128 pp. |

REVIEW

THE MOTION PICTURE — CHUCK HANSEN—ONE GUY!

"Chuck Hansen-One Guy" is a new 16 mm. film on group-relations in industry. It is in color and sound with background music cleared for possible use on television broadcasts. The running time is 26 minutes.

This film, in documentary style, was produced for the National Conference of Christians and Jews by D.P.M. Productions in New York City. The major portion of the scenes were photographed in the Bayonne plant of the General Cable Corporation in Bayonne, New Jersey. Flashbacks and descriptive materials were obtained in and around New York City and give to the picture an industrial and urban emphasis.

In the film there are no professional actors, but the cast of characters includes 102 people with 42 workers from the plant. In addition to the workers, group specialists — psychologists and anthropologists, clergy, community-relations experts, and social scientists — are featured.

"Chuck Hansen-One Guy" differs from most films in this field in that it is a delineation of one solution of the problem of discrimination in industry. The emphasis is on the solution. Very little attention is given to the development of the "problem" of discrimination. The "solution" presented is the group-discussion program developed by the Commission on Labor-Management Organizations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The picture describes the selection of the participants, organization of the discussion, role of the moderator in the discussion, contributions of the resource consultants, interaction among the group, and the projection of the discussions into the life of the plant. This material is handled with sustained suspense and with meticulous attention to the dramatic values inherent in a progressive, fast-moving plot.

Experts who have seen previews of the film have indicated that it will have a universal appeal. Although the background of the film is industrial, the techniques used in the solution of discrimination are sufficiently provocative to interest group specialists in education, religion, community life, and even more general television and motion picture audiences. The dramatic presentation of the theme, the effective use of commercial koda-chrome color, and careful selection of background result in a film which will be interesting to all groups of lay and professional people.

Purchases of the print in color may be made from the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Rentals of the print by day or by week can be secured from the distribution agency, Films of the Nation, 62 West 45th Street, New York City or from the Labor-Management Organizations Commission, National Conference of Christians and Jews, 387 Fourth Avenue, New York City.

-
e
-
r.
t
s
y
s
e
,
t
-
e
d
-
d
n
s
-
d
c
ll
l,
-
y
e
-
h
-
k
st
-
h

A